UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,205	08/22/2005	Aarnoud Willem Eversdijk	2837/73736/NHZ	3683
Norman H Zivii	7590 06/23/200 n	EXAMINER		
Cooper & Dunh		DUNN, DANIELLE N		
1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/522,205	EVERSDIJK, AARNOUD WILLEM		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Danielle Dunn	2875		

	Danielle Dunn	2875	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-14. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has bee		•	
allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Sharon E. Payne/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2875			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The finality of the office action is proper because applicant's amendment filed 10/17/2007 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in the Final Office Action mailed 1/17/2008. The claims have been given their broadest possible interpretation. It is not proper to import limitations from the specification into the claims. Regarding applicant's attempts to define the structure of the invention using the instant disclosure (i.e. lamp fitting or socket) the Applicant is reminded that it is the language of the claims what defines the patentable subject matter, not the detailed description of the invention or the drawings. Reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is quite different from reading limitations of the specification into a claim, to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the language of the claim. Furthermore, In response to applicant's arguments that Chadwick (US 5,170,975) failed to disclose individually, or suggest in combination, "any information about a lamp fitting or socket" the applicant is respectfully reminded that, while it might be evident, by comparing the patented structure of Chadwick (US 5,170,975) with the instant specification and drawings, that the claimed invention is different from the Prior Art made of record, that is not the test for patentability. Rather, it is the language of the claims what defines the meets and bounds of the instant invention. In this case, Chadwick teaches a fitting for a lamp (i.e. the articulated arm 14 is broadly interpreted as a fitting for a lamp). The applicant is also advised to review the Final Office Action mailed 1/17/2008, especially pages 2-4 where the bottom of lamp 20 is "equated" to the lamp cap which is disclosed by the invention."